

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-34, which have been rejected by the Examiner. By this response, claims 1, 15, 31, and 34 have been amended.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to further recite that the least one gaming console requests and buffers the plurality of game outcomes from the gaming server appropriate to one or more games to be played at the at least one gaming console and, before all of the outcomes have been used, the at least one gaming console requests replacement outcomes from the server. Additionally, the at least one gaming console does not wait for a response from the server before giving the player feedback regarding a game. The at least one gaming console processes user input and takes actions without waiting for commands from the server.

Independent claims 31 and 34 have been amended to further recite that the gaming console describes a game or gamble to the secure storage and processing device, and, in response to a command regarding the game or gamble, the secure storage and processing device generates a response, stores information for later transmission to a server, and then sends a response to the gaming console.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-16, 19-26, 28, and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier (U.S. Patent No. 5,871,398). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

As indicated by the Examiner, Schneier fails to disclose the server creating a plurality of random seeds ... to provide a plurality of predetermined outcomes for future games. In Schneier, an off-line lottery system enables players to purchase instant-type lottery game outcomes for a central computer and view the outcomes remotely. See, e.g., Abstract. Schneier enables a player to play instant-type tickets as they would traditional paper scratch-off tickets. Col. 1, lines 18-25. The ticket contains indicia indicating a win/lose result or prize status. Col. 1, lines 34-37. A handheld ticket viewer (HTV 20) allows a player to view the ticket results. See, e.g., Fig. 3.

However, the system of Schneier fails to disclose that a gaming console requests and buffers a plurality of game outcomes from a gaming server appropriate to one or more games to be played at the gaming console and, before all of the outcomes have been used, the gaming console requests replacement outcomes from the server. Additionally, Schneier fails to disclose that the gaming console does not wait for a response from the server before giving the player feedback regarding a game, and that the gaming console processes user input and takes actions without waiting for commands from the server. These limitations are recited in combination in independent claims 1 and 15 of the present application.

Furthermore, Schneier fails to disclose that a gaming console describes a game or gamble to a secure storage and processing device, and, in response to a command regarding the game or gamble, the secure storage and processing device generates a

response, stores information for later transmission to a server, and then sends a response to the gaming console. These limitations are recited in independent claims 31 and 34.

Rather, Schneier simply reveals lottery results on the card. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that the pending claims of the present application should be allowable and the Examiner's rejection withdrawn.

Claims 3, 13, 17, 27, 29, 33, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier in view of McCarthy (U.S. Patent No. 5,276,312). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Schneier as well as the reasons below.

As the Examiner states, Schneier fails to disclose a secure storage and processing device that is a smartcard or smartcard chip. While McCarthy discloses a smartcard, McCarthy simply stores verified wager lotteries, instant game outcomes, and immediate payout number matching games using the smartcard as the transfer media. See, e.g., Abstract. As with Schneier, the processing capability of the secure storage and processing device and the interaction with both the gaming console and the server is absent in the smartcard system of McCarthy. In McCarthy, the lottery tickets are stored on the card, and the winning outcome is determined later by a central processor. See, e.g., col. 1, lines 7-28. A player is guessing which number(s) will be chosen, rather than having outcomes downloaded and playing out the game with the secure storage and processing device and the gaming console as recited in the presently pending claims. See, e.g., col. 2, lines 6-24 and col. 8, lines 35-40.

As with Schneier, the system of McCarthy fails to disclose that a gaming console requests and buffers a plurality of game outcomes from a gaming server appropriate to one or more games to be played at the gaming console and, before all of the outcomes have been used, the gaming console requests replacement outcomes from the server. Additionally, McCarthy fails to disclose that the gaming console does not wait for a response from the server before giving the player feedback regarding a game, and that the gaming console processes user input and takes actions without waiting for commands from the server. These limitations are recited in combination in independent claims 1 and 15 of the present application, from which claims 3, 13, 17, 27, and 29 depend.

Furthermore, McCarthy fails to disclose that a gaming console describes a game or gamble to a secure storage and processing device, and, in response to a command regarding the game or gamble, the secure storage and processing device generates a response, stores information for later transmission to a server, and then sends a response to the gaming console. These limitations are recited in independent claims 31 and 34, as well as claim 33, which depends from claim 31.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that the pending claims of the present application should be allowable and the Examiner's rejection withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In general, the Office Action makes various statements regarding the pending claims and the cited references that are now moot in light of the above. Thus, the Applicants will not address such statements at the present time. However, the Applicants expressly reserve the right to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise (e.g., if such statement should become relevant by appearing in a rejection of any current or future claim).

It is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowability is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account of MHM, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 25, 2008

/Christopher N. George/
Christopher N. George
Reg. No. 51,728

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 W. Madison Street
34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661
Phone (312) 775-8000
Fax (312) 775-8100